

REMARKS

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 CFR. § 1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0005] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-34 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 15, and 29. No claims are added, withdrawn, or cancelled herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0006] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on February 3, 2009. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0007] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0008] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to indicate that the proposed clarifying claim amendments appeared to

distinguish over the cited art of record. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0009] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0010] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0011] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0012] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1-34 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter.

Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

[0013] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 15, and 29 is found in the specification at least in paragraphs 31-49.

Formal Matters

Claim Objections

[0014] The Examiner objects to claim 15 for an informality. More specifically, the Examiner objects to the lack of antecedent basis for the term "the hardware device." In response, Applicant has amended the claim to obviate the objection.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0015] The Examiner rejects claims 1-34 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0016] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0017] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Chang:** *Chang*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0162027 (Published August 19, 2004);
- **Wittel:** *Wittel, et al.*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0195951 (Published October 16, 2003); and
- **Beyda:** *Beyda, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,260,160 (issued July 10, 2001).

Overview of the Application

[0018] The Application describes a technology for obtaining information regarding an installed hardware device, whether or not the device is attached to the computer system. In a described implementation, a method includes collecting information regarding an installed device on a computing device. The information is presented (e.g., to an end-user with local access to the computing device). The installed device does not have to be attached to the computing

device and no booting into a special mode (e.g., a troubleshooting mode) is required. The information may also be modified in response to a modification request (e.g., provided by an end-user through a graphical user interface). Furthermore, the information presented may include all data available to the operating system regarding the installed device.

Cited References

[0019] The Examiner cites Chang as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Wittel and Beyda as secondary references in the obviousness-based rejections.

Chang

[0020] Chang describes a technology for a Bluetooth wireless communication apparatus and method for indicating devices connectable to ad-hoc networks. The Bluetooth wireless communication apparatus is provided with a user interface and a control unit. The user interface enables a user to select a device to which he or she wishes to connect. The control unit provides, through the user interface, information on peripheral devices in a range connectable to the wireless communication device, and, if a device to which the user wants to connect is selected through the user interface, establishes a connection to only a device to which the user wishes to connect, out of the peripheral devices. Accordingly, connection is made only to a device that a user wishes, while

connection to the devices to which the user does not want to connect is not made.

Wittel

[0021] Wittel describes a technology for dynamically detecting, downloading and installing drivers on a client system. The present invention operates in a client/server architecture of a network environment. In operation, information relating to a client system is provided to a server, and that information is used to match available driver information located on the server to the received client system information.

Beyda

[0022] Beyda describes a technology for remotely troubleshooting a local computer connected to an array of local peripheral devices include a data collector connected to the local computer. The data collector includes a signal interceptor for intercepting signaling information transmitted by the computer to the peripheral devices. The intercepted signaling information has been formatted for processing by the local peripheral devices at a point of interception. The data collector further includes a transceiver having a transceiver input configured to relay signaling information received from remote peripheral devices located at a remote troubleshooting site to input/output (I/O) ports of local peripheral devices. A transceiver output is configured to transmit intercepted signaling information to the remote peripheral devices at the remote troubleshooting site.

Each local peripheral device corresponds to a remote peripheral device having substantially identical functional and signaling capabilities as the local peripheral device. Upon receipt at a remote peripheral device, intercepted signaling information has a format which is substantially identical to the format of the intercepted signaling information at the point of interception. A technician located at the remote troubleshooting site is able to remotely operate the computer via the data collector and is able to monitor performance of the remote peripheral devices to diagnose a malfunction associated with the local computer and the local peripheral devices.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0023] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Chang, Wittel, and Beyda

[0024] The Examiner rejects claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, Wittel, and Beyda. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0025] Applicant submits that combination of Chang, Wittel, and Beyda does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim:

- "collecting, by a computing device, information about an installed device on the computing device, wherein the information is collected using function calls of an application programming interface of an operating system environment of the computing device"
- "presenting, by the computing device, the information on the computing device through a user interface"

[0026] In contrast, the cited references describe techniques for determining information about remote, uninstalled devices capable of engaging in a personal area network connection with the device performing the determining (Chang) and for determining information about a locally installed device driver, providing that information to a server, and receiving a list of new/updated drivers from the server.

[0027] Nothing in the combined references teaches or suggests presenting, via a user interface, collected information about an *installed device*. The locally installed device drivers are merely software to interface with devices, not devices in and of themselves, and the devices discussed in Chang are *uninstalled* devices that are in the process of being discovered. Thus, even combined, the references simply do not discuss or even suggest “collecting ... information about an installed device on the computing device”, as is claimed in claim 1.

[0028] Further, nothing in the combined references teaches or suggests collecting device information “using function calls of an application programming interface of an operating system environment of the computing device.” The only reference which discusses the obtaining of device information – Chang – makes no mention of doing so using function calls of an API, much less function calls of an API of *an operating system environment*, as claimed in claim 1.

[0029] As shown above, the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 15 and 29

[0030] These claims include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 15 and 29 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Dependent Claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-34

[0031] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 15, and 29. As discussed above, claims 1, 15, and 29 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Conclusion

[0032] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/

Dated: April 6, 2009

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; x5005)

Registration No. 53725

Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)

Registration No. 56826

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com